



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/899,410	07/23/1997	DEANE E. GALLOWAY		7052
7590 11/02/2004 MARGATET M. DUNCAN MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 227 WEST MONROE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER TARAZANO, DONALD LAWRENCE	
			ART UNIT 1773	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/899,410	Applicant(s) GALLOWAY ET AL.	
	Examiner D. Lawrence Tarazano	Art Unit 1773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The previous Examiner, Rena Dye, accepted a new position at the USPTO and transferred this case to Examiner Tarazano; please direct all future correspondence to him.
2. As the applicants are well aware, interference has been set up between 6,437,064 and several competing patent applications. The examiner has withdrawn the art rejection in view of the applicants' arguments regarding the obvious substitution of one single site catalyzed polyolefin for Ziegler / Natta catalyzed polyolefins in shrinkable films.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 22-44 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-27 of copending Application No. 09/369,978. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The second and third layers of the copending application contain a specific blend containing single site catalyzed polyethylene and the instant claims encompass any heat shrinkable barrier film structure containing two-surface layers containing

Art Unit: 1773

single site catalyzed alpha-olefin copolymers. One could not practice the copending claims without infringing on the instant claims

(09/369,978)

22. A heat shrink film, comprising:

(a) a first barrier layer, said first barrier layer having two opposing surfaces; and

(b) second and third layers, said first barrier layer being disposed between said second and third layers, said second and third layers comprising blends of from about 1% to about 99% of an ethylene alpha-olefin copolymer formed by a polymerization reaction in the presence of a single site catalyst, said ethylene alpha-olefin copolymer having a molecular weight distribution of less than 2.5 and a I_{10}/I_2 ratio of about 7 to 12; and from about 99% to about 1% ethylene vinyl acetate copolymer;

wherein said film is irradiated.

5. Claims 22-44 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17, 18, 20, and 21 of copending Application No. 09/369,980. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because one could not practice the copending claims without infringing on the instant claims (the claims in 09/369,980 are of similar scope to those in claim 22 above with the simple addition of adhesive layers. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included adhesive layers where necessary or to omit them where they were not.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1773

6. Claims 22-44 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-39 of U.S. Patent No. 6,437,064. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the allowed patent clearly teaches shrinkable films having a barrier layer and surface layers made from single site catalyzed materials. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included adhesive layers where necessary or to omit them where they were not.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Lawrence Tarazano whose telephone number is (571)-272-1515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6:00 (off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571)-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Lawrence Tarazano
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DLT' or similar, enclosed within a simple, hand-drawn oval or loop.